



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,139	10/14/2003	Steve Mitchell	KLYC-1075US1	4489
7590 02/01/2006			EXAMINER	
Sheldon R. Meyer FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP Four Embarcadero Center Fourth Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-4156			HOFFMAN, MARY C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3733	
DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/685,139

Applicant(s)

MITCHELL, STEVE

Examiner

Mary Hoffman

Art Unit

3733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 70-76 and 78-81 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 and 77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: ref. #'s 346 and 510. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains phrases which can be implied, such as "the present invention...". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

Art Unit: 3733

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9, 13-26, 30-43, 47-58, and 62-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,415,659).

Lee et al. disclose an implant comprising a body (FIG. 1, ref. #22), at least one hook/flange extending from the body capable of allowing the body to engage a vertebra (FIG. 1, ref. #30 and #50), a beam extending from the body (FIG. 8, ref. #90), the beam having a distal end that contacts a spinous process of another vertebra, and a device that secures the beam to the body (FIG. 8, ref. #80). The device secures the beam to the body in a plurality of positions (col. 5, lines 31-46). The distal end of the beam, the spacer, is bulbous and is round (FIG. 8, ref. #90). The spacer (FIG. 8, end part of ref. #90) has a first end capable of contacting a first vertebrae without being attached to the first vertebrae, and a beam extending from the first end (FIG. 8, ref. #90). Furthermore, the spacer is capable of contacting a first vertebra without being attached to the first

Art Unit: 3733

vertebra. The beam is capable of being mounted to the base, and the base is capable of being mounted to a second vertebrae. The distal end of the beam provides a surface that is at an angle to the beam. The surface is capable of engaging L5 vertebra. The surface that is capable of spreading a contact load between a L5 vertebra and the distal end. The distal end of the beam is capable of engaging a spinous process of a L5 vertebra without being attached to a second vertebra. The distal end of the beam is capable of engaging a spinous process of a L5 vertebra over a conforming contact area. The distal end of the beam includes a convex surface (FIG. 8, ref. #90) that is capable of engaging a spinous process of a L5 vertebra in order to spread the load between the distal end of the beam and the spinous process of the L5 vertebrae. The beam includes an elongated aperture (FIG. 8, ref. # 92). The device extends through the aperture and can be secured to the aperture in a plurality of positions in order to position the beam relative to the body in a plurality of positions (col. 5, lines 31-46). The elongated aperture of the beam receives a post extending from the base (FIG. 8, ref. #80). A lock cooperates with the post of the base to secure the beam to the base (FIG. 1, ref. #82). The body includes a first portion and a second portion (FIG. 2, ref. #32 and #52) with a beam platform located between the first and second portions (FIG. 1, ref. #70). There is a space between the platform and first and second portions. The hook extends from the first portion and another hook extends from the second portion. The device extends from the platform. The implant comprises a device that is capable of securing the base to an S1 vertebra (FIG. 2, ref. #72). The implant is capable of being positioned between the S1 and L5 vertebrae, without being attached to the L5 vertebra.

With regard the statement of intended use and other functional statements, they do not impose any structural limitations on the claims distinguishable over Lee et al. which is capable of being used as claimed if one so desires to do so. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Furthermore, the law of anticipation does not require that the reference "teach" what the subject patent teaches, but rather it is only necessary that the claims under attack "read on" something in the reference. *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.*, 218 USPQ 781 (CCPA 1983). Furthermore, the manner in which a device is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-12, 27-29, 44-46, and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,415,659).

Lee et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the implant being made from a material such as polyetheretherketone, polyaryletheretherketone, and polyetherketoneketone, polyetherketoneetherketoneketone,

Art Unit: 3733

polyetheretherketoneketone, polyketone, polyetherketone, or titanium. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct at least a part of the device of Lee et al. from a material such as polyetheretherketone, polyaryletheretherketone, polyetherketoneketone, polyetherketoneetherketoneketone, polyetheretherketoneketone, polyketone, polyetherketone, or titanium, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the Lee et al. patent teaches that the intended use of the device is to attached to the first vertebrae, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). The Lee et al. reference teaches that the device is to be attached to a first vertebra, however, the device would be perfectly capable of "...contacting a first vertebra wherein the first end is not attached to the first vertebrae..." since this is merely a statement of intended use. For example, the limitation of claim 1 "...contacting a first vertebra wherein the first end is not attached to the first vertebrae..." can be satisfied by a

Art Unit: 3733

person simply taking the device of Lee et al. and touching it to a vertebrae, such that the device touches a first vertebra. Similar is true for amended claims 7, 9, 26, 43, 58, and 77.

Regarding applicant's argument for the withdraw of the 103(a) rejections since they depend from the amended claims 9, 26, 43, and 58, the Examiner asserts that the rejections are still proper because the amended claims 9, 26, 43, and 58 are still rejected under 102(b) as explained above.

Therefore, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(b) are deemed proper.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-5566. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo C. Robert can be reached on 571-272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MCH



EDUARDO C. ROBERT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER